

Remarks

Claim 1 has been amended to emphasize the optional nature of the step of passing the communication to be modified to become a final communication in response to the extracted stored data.

The optional nature of the step of passing a communication for review is indicated by choice box 220 in Figure 10, the consequential review and optional actual modification steps being indicated in Figures 11 and 12.

It is believed that the other independent claims reflect such limitation.

As acknowledged by the examiner, (Page 8, lines 14-17), in rejecting the claims as unpatentable over Pollack in view of Powers, Pollack teaching alone is deficient in not disclosing or suggesting that (the step of) passing an initial communication to be modified to become a final communication is optional.

Contrary, however to the examiner's subsequent assertion, the teaching of Powers does not overcome such deficiency.

Powers teaches a method of generating written correspondence from text and internet email messages. Prior to sending a correspondence, the email is always imported into a GUI for amendment and changes. After the correspondence has been imported into the GUI, the act of making amendments and changes is optional, but crucially the step of passing the correspondence for amendment is not compulsory.

As pointed out above, in contrast to the teaching of Powers, the claims require that the review step is optional depending upon whether certain terms appear in the final communication. That is, if no terms of a certain criteria appear in the communication, then no review step will occur. That is different to Powers which will

generate a review step even if a review is unnecessary.

In other words, claim 1 differs from the prior art because in the prior art there is no step of 'optionally passing the communication to be modified', only a step of complusorily passing the communication to be modified.

Thus, the deficiency in the teaching of the primary reference Pollack is not overcome by the teaching of Powers, as although, according to Powers, actual modification of the communication is optional, Powers teaches as a whole that all communications must be passed (for review) for modification.

Accordingly, it is submitted that the claims cannot be deemed unpatentable under 35 USC 103 over Pollack in view of Powers and favorable reconsideration of the application is requested.

Respectfully submitted,
/Robert W.J. Usher/
Robert W.J. Usher
Customer 04518; reg 30932
212 633 1076